

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/772,938	02/05/2004	Chii-Ming Wu	TS03-493	6085	
42717	7590 06/30/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			SMITH, B	SMITH, BRADLEY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
<i>51122115</i> , 1	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		2891	<u> </u>	
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2000	DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Į	/	/

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/772,938	WU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Bradley K. Smith	2891				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 M	a <u>y 2006</u> .					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 2/5/04 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/2/06. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/2/06.						

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 9 – 11, 18, 19, 20, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei in view of Tan et al. (Effect of titanium cap in reducing interfacial oxides in the formation of nickel silicides).

Wei et al. (US 5,047,367) discloses a method of forming a metal silicide in a MOSFET device comprising the steps of providing a MOSFET device on a semiconductor substrate 10 with a conductive gate 21, gate insulator 22, and a heavily doped source 23/drain 24 region, forming an interlayer material 11, forming a metal layer 12, performing an anneal procedure to form a metal silicide 13 while forming a layer comprising the metal and interlayer material on insulator spacers 25, and removing the layer from the insulator spacers [column 8, lines 1-5].

Regarding claim 7, Wei *et al.* further discloses a titanium interlayer material [column 5, lines 65-67].

Regarding claim 9, Wei *et al.* further discloses a nickel layer formed by physical vapor deposition [column 5, line 45; column 6, line 2] with a thickness of 50 – 300 Å [column 5, line 57].

Regarding claim 10, Wei *et al.* further discloses an RTA process performed at a temperature between 600 – 750 °C [column 6, lines 5-20].

Regarding claim 11, Wei *et al.* discloses a method of forming a metal silicide in a MOSFET device comprising the steps of providing a MOSFET device on a semiconductor substrate 10 with a conductive gate 21, gate insulator 22, and a heavily doped source 23/drain 24 region, forming a titanium interlayer material 11, forming a nickel layer 12, performing an RTA procedure to form a metal silicide 13 while forming a layer comprising the Ni and Ti material on insulator spacers 25, and removing the Ni-Ti layer from the insulator spacers [column 8, lines 1-5].

Regarding claim 18, Wei *et al.* further discloses a nickel layer formed by physical vapor deposition [column 5, line 45; column 6, line 2] with a thickness of 50 – 300 Å [column 5, line 57].

Regarding claim 19, Wei *et al.* further discloses an RTA process performed at a temperature between 600 – 750 °C [column 6, lines 5-20].

Wei fails to disclose a interlayer material having a device thickness of less than 15 angstroms.

However Tan et al. disclose the formation of a 10 angstrom titanium cap.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wei and Tan because the titanium would protect the nickel from oxygen contamination (see Tan et al. p2908 section C).

Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al. and Tan et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Chu et al.

Wei *et al.* teaches a silicon dioxide gate oxide layer [column 7, line 35], but does not discuss thermal oxidation with a thickness of 10 – 100 Å. Chu *et al.* (6,767,831) teaches a thermal oxide with a thickness of 15 – 50 Å [column 3, lines 30-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the thermal oxide of Chu *et al.* in the method of Wei *et al.* and Tan et al. since this provides a deep submicron device with low parasitic current leakage.

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al. and Tan et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Tsai et al.

Wei *et al.* and Tan et al. teach a polysilicon gate structure but does not discuss a particular gate thickness. Tsai *et al.* (US 5,702,972) teaches a polysilicon gate structure with a thickness of 2000 – 3000 Å [column 2, lines 49-50]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the thicknesses of Tsai *et al.* in the method of Wei *et al.* and Tan et al. since this provides a conventional thickness for etching gate structures.

1. Claims 4 – 6 and 14 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei *et al.* and Tan et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Ishida *et al.*

Wei et al. and Tan et al. teach a silicon oxide spacer but does not discuss the width of the gate, the thickness of the spacer, or the depth of the source/drain regions. Ishida et al. (US 2003/0170969) teaches a MOSFET with a gate width of 0.25 µm and

Application/Control Number: 10/772,938 Page 5

Art Unit: 2891

source/drain depth of 2000 Å [0003] and a spacer thickness of 200 – 1500 Å [0026]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the device sizes of Ishida *et al.* in the method of Wei *et al.* and Tan et al. since these provide high density and performance in ultra-large scale integrated devices.

2. Claims 8, 17, 26, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al. and Tan et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Fang et al.

Wei et al. and Tan et al. teach the limitations of claims 7, 11, and 20 including a titanium layer, but does not discuss forming a titanium layer by atomic layer deposition (ALD). Fang et al. (US 6,916,729) teaches a titanium layer formed by ALD [column 5, lines 40-55]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the ALD method of Fang et al. to form a thin Ti layer in the method of Wei et al. and Tan et al. since this provides a preferable method of controlling deposition of a few atomic layers of titanium.

3. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al.. and Tan et al. and as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Chu et al.

Wei *et al.* as modified by Tan *et al.* teaches a silicon dioxide gate oxide layer [column 7, line 35], but does not discuss thermal oxidation with a thickness of 10 – 100 Å. Chu *et al.* teaches a thermal oxide with a thickness of 15 – 50 Å [column 3, lines 30-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the thermal oxide of Chu *et al.* in the method of Wei *et al.* since this provides a deep submicron device with low parasitic current leakage.

Application/Control Number: 10/772,938 Page 6

Art Unit: 2891

4. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al. and Tan et al. as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Tsai et al.

Wei *et al.* as modified by Tan *et al.* teaches a polysilicon gate structure but does not discuss a particular gate thickness. Tsai *et al.* teaches a polysilicon gate structure with a thickness of 2000 – 3000 Å [column 2, lines 49-50]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the thicknesses of Tsai *et al.* in the method of Wei *et al.* since this provides a conventional thickness for etching gate structures.

5. Claims 23 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wei et al. and Tan et al. as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Ishida et al.

Wei et al. as modified by Tan et al. teaches a silicon oxide spacer but does not discuss the width of the gate, the thickness of the spacer, or the depth of the source/drain regions. Ishida et al. teaches a MOSFET with a gate width of 0.25 µm and source/drain depth of 2000 Å [0003] and a spacer thickness of 200 – 1500 Å [0026]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the device sizes of Ishida et al. in the method of Wei et al. since these provide high density and performance in ultra-large scale integrated devices.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kim et al. disclose that it is well known to deposit titanium via ALD (paragraph 0070).

Application/Control Number: 10/772,938 Page 7

Art Unit: 2891

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley K. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bradley K Smith Primary Examiner Art Unit 2891